

**S3TAIR Project Effective Practice Validation Site Visit Protocol**

**Team Consensus Evaluation**

**Mineola UFSD**

**Mineola Middle School**

**Nomination Area: Positive Academic and Behavioral Supports & Interventions**

**Practice: Tiered Instructional Support & Intervention Model**

**Site Visit Date: May 1, 2009**

District Information			
District/building: Mineola UFSD/Mineola Middle School (MMS)		Practice: Tiered intervention model	
Visit date(s): May 1, 2009		Visitor: Harold J. Dean, Long Island RFF Dr. Peter Kozik, Syracuse University Domenica Catalano, Long Island RSSC Yvonne Sinisgalli, Long Island Parent Center	
<b>Persons interviewed:</b>	Name	Position/Title	Grade/Location
	Whittney Smith	Assistant Principal	MMS
	Jennifer Maichin	IST Chairperson	MMS
	Sonia Azevedo	Psychologist	MMS
	Stephanie Honig	Guidance Counselor	MMS
	Josiane Halilej	Speech Language Pathologist	MMS
<b>Staff observed:</b>	Ian Dunst	Tier III Math	MMS
	Kathy DeVita	Tier II Math	MMS
	Joan Eisele-Cooper	Tier III Reading	MMS
	Ilyse Milberg	Tier II Reading	MMS
<b>Other information sources accessed by visitor:</b>		<p>The team had the opportunity to speak with three parents and two students about their experiences within the tiered support classes.</p> <p>The team also participated in an archival review of documentation of MMS's development of their model, which included protocol and planning forms, scheduling samples, trainings and agendas, evidence of parent involvement, presentations, and an evolution of the model from inception to current.</p>	

### Exploring the School's Process for Selection of the Nominated Practice - No Point Assignment

Questions to those responsible for initial implementation: Please tell us why you chose this particular practice.

**Probe:** Was the practice recommended to you by someone, and if so, who?

**Probe:** Did you explore education literature to determine the evidence supporting this practice before you adopted it? If so, can you give us some examples of studies you explored?

**Probe:** Did you visit schools that had implemented the practice successfully? If so, did the school share data to document the effectiveness of the practice?

**Probe:** Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about your decision and the evidence that supported it?

Directions to Visitors: Document the answers to this question and probes in this space.

Mineola's central administration wanted Mineola Middle School to devise a plan to improve their math and ELA outcomes for all students. They specifically requested instruction be provided in smaller groups in a more targeted manner. In response, the middle school developed a tiered intervention model for special education student and those identified as at-risk. The middle school has had a functioning Instructional Support Team for several years prior, and decided to build in this intervention model to the IST process for consistency. The model and its intervention strategies are based on current research in RtI.

The manner in which the catalog of tiered interventions was developed demonstrates a true ownership approach. The entire faculty engaged in the process of developing interventions for certain student concerns, academic and behavioral. The teams devised current effective practices, which were later correlated to research and tagged with implementation documentation for teachers to refer to. Following such a process is what the MMS administration attributes to the building-wide ownership of this intervention model, as all teachers were a part of its development, versus being told what and when to do.

Mineola's IST Team & Staff researched various RtI resources and data that laid the foundation they needed to move their model forward, including two visits—one to a charter school in Connecticut, the other to a district on Long Island.

**Data COLLECTION for Analysis to Inform Practice : - The district/building has:**

<b>More fully developed</b>		<b>Less fully developed</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Developed and implemented rigorous practice for data collection, including centralized data manager or team.</li> <li>○ Collected data collection from multiple sources, including but not limited to state, commercially available, internal/external formative and summative assessments, diagnostics and progress monitoring.</li> <li>○ Provided systematic and consistent training on how to collect and organize data.</li> <li>○ Conducted periodic review of data collection process to ensure accuracy and consistency.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Developed and implemented practice for data collection, including centralized data manger or team.</li> <li>○ Collected data from two sources.</li> <li>○ Provided minimal training on how to collect and organize data.</li> <li>○ Not conducted periodic review to ensure accuracy and consistency of data collection.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of a data collection process but no clear centralized data collection manager or team.</li> <li>○ Collected data from a single data source.</li> <li>○ Not provided training related to data collection and or organization.</li> <li>○ Not conducted periodic review to ensure accuracy and consistency of data collection.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No developed practice for data collection related to nominated practice.</li> </ul>
<b>Look Fors</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Centralized Data manager</li> <li>✓ Evidence (documentation) of systematic and comprehensive collection and reporting of data.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-assessment (baseline), interim, and summative data</li> <li>• Evidence of and rationale for multiple sources of measurement of student outcomes built into data sets for analysis</li> <li>• Data collection schedule or calendar.</li> <li>• Charts and other graphic representations of data</li> <li>• Evidence of data collection longitudinally</li> <li>• Evidence of data collection for student cohorts.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Evidence that collected data are organized an reported or made available to all stakeholders in a comprehensible format</li> <li>✓ Evidence that PD on data collection processes is provided to all associated with data collection</li> <li>✓ Evidence of support for classroom-based data collection for progress monitoring and/or action research</li> <li>✓ Evidence of regular evaluation of data collection procedures and practices with adjustment for improvements as needed</li> <li>✓ Adjustment to instruments, database, reporting procedures.</li> <li>✓ Evidence of a practice of periodic reporting on collected data to stakeholders</li> </ul>	

### Data Collection for Analysis to Inform Practice (continued)

#### Comments:

Data is collected from multiple sources, including progress monitoring, student work samples, in-class and State assessments, and parent and teacher recommendations. There are scheduled data collection intervals, which is recorded on data sheets by individual teachers. There are two levels of data management, as the guidance counselor ensures that teachers are collecting necessary data in accordance to the data sheets, and the IST chairperson manages the data and its presentation once data sheets are submitted. Regular training and review of data collection procedures was evidenced in the archival review, which takes place several times a year.

Additionally, Mineola engaged in a process to develop their own baseline data, as the national data from their data management system (AIMSweb) were lower than what their student outcomes were. Rtl Direct is also used in the data collection and management process.

Data reporting has been made easy and efficient in the process with single sheets distributed to all reporting teachers and single sheet monitoring of research based interventions. The problem-solving IST model also provides data for monitoring progress, all following a protocol that has been revised over several years. Longitudinal data exist and are accessible, as all students discussed by IST are *de facto* monitored longitudinally. A continual feedback loop for data has been established: use of an intervention generates more problem solving which generates additional interventions, etc.

### ANALYSIS of Data to Inform Decisions – The district/building:

More fully developed		Less fully developed	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides on-going staff development of skills for use of data analysis in decision-making.</li> <li>○ Makes data driven decision a priority by providing time and support.</li> <li>○ Analyzes data at the building &amp; classroom level including individual and disaggregated group performance on group assessments and day-to-day classroom performance data.</li> <li>○ Ensures building wide and individual use of analyzed data to make decisions about instruction at classroom and system level.</li> <li>○ Ensures that administrators and instructional staff collaboratively consider summative data annually for decisions about programmatic changes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides initial staff development of skills for use of data analysis in decision but has provided for ongoing PD and TA.</li> <li>○ Has <u>not</u> scheduled specific times for data analysis to inform instruction.</li> <li>○ Analyzes data only at the building level to disaggregate group performance on group assessments.</li> <li>○ Makes some data-based instructional decisions at classroom/system level</li> <li>○ Administrators consider summative data to make decisions about need for programmatic changes but do not engage other staff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides little or no staff development of skills for use of data analysis in decision-making.</li> <li>○ Provides no scheduled and supported opportunity for staff to collaborate regarding data use and decision-making.</li> <li>○ Uses little or no disaggregation of data of individual or group performance on assessments.</li> <li>○ Does not use data to make decisions regarding school wide instructional practices or programmatic changes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Does not have a consistent practice for using data to make decisions</li> </ul>
Look Fors			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Database/reporting is comprehensive and accessible to all stakeholders.</li> <li>✓ Acceptable turn around time for internal formative assessments &amp; progress monitoring.</li> <li>✓ PD (internal/external/district wide) on data analysis and decision making - for example:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding what data represent</li> <li>• Using data to differentiate or form intervention groups,</li> <li>• Strategies for progress monitoring.</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ Evidence of scheduled times dedicated to data analysis for decision making by instructional team, grade level, content area, et cetera</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Evidence of data analysis and resulting decisions that led to changes in practice and improved student outcomes</li> <li>✓ Written description of process used in decision making (e.g., specific data sources analyzed, strategies for identifying hypotheses and interventions from data, structures to support implementation, analysis of impact, and adjustment to interventions as needed)</li> <li>✓ Evidence that analysis of data has resulted in changes in core program or supplements, addition of service providers (TAs, Literacy Specialist, AIS), et cetera</li> <li>✓ Evidence of monitoring of decision making process, with identification of areas in need of improvement and provision of PD/TA in the areas of need</li> </ul>	

### Analysis of Data to Inform Decisions (continued)

#### Comments:

Mineola's intervention model relies strictly on data analysis. The data collected by individual teachers is submitted to the IST chair and is analyzed by the team during the meeting in order to make appropriate tier placements and intervention recommendations. Baseline data are clearly established and utilized. Consistent measurements, structure, and analysis takes place via Mineola's baseline data comparison. There are also regular meetings between grade levels and teams to discuss data, as well as staff development sessions on such, evidenced in the archival review.

Data for IST are used in problem solving and intervention decisions. Data used for monitoring student progress through tiers of interventions are purposeful. Classifications of MS students are supported by thorough and extensive documentation of evidence. Data are well organized, easily read and understood. Students are provided on-going goal setting to support their efforts at learning. Teachers, students, parents, administrators access data directly and regularly.

Fidelity of Implementation - The district/building:			
More fully developed ←			→ Less fully developed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Has established a protocol for monitoring implementation of the practice to ensure fidelity of implementation</li> <li>○ Has a defined strategy for professional development/technical assistance for correcting drift from fidelity</li> <li>○ Has documentation of fidelity monitoring and adjustment protocol in action</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Has a protocol for monitoring implementation of the practice to determine fidelity to the model</li> <li>○ Does <u>not</u> have documentation of functional use of protocol.</li> <li>○ Does <u>not</u> have a defined or consistent technical assistance/ professional development strategy for correcting drift when fidelity is not found.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Has an informal practice of monitoring implementation when reports of drift from the model are received</li> <li>○ Has an informal practice for provision of technical assistance/ professional development to correct drift from fidelity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Does not monitor implementation to determine fidelity of implementation</li> </ul>
Look Fors			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Evidence that administrators/instructional staff can accurately describe the critical elements of the practice as validated through research, and discuss how they should be and are implemented in the school</li> <li>✓ Documented program goals and steps in implementation of the practice (i.e. manual describing implementation, classroom charts of practice steps, checklist of steps in implementation)</li> <li>✓ Documented structures for checking fidelity of implementation (e.g., written guidelines of what to look for, how often to look, how to evaluate what is observed to determine fidelity of implementation)</li> <li>✓ Evidence/documentation of validation procedures used consistently across all implementers using program guidelines.</li> <li>✓ Evidence results of fidelity observation are used to monitor and adjust practice implementation to recover from drift away from fidelity</li> </ul>			
Comments: <p>There is extensive documentation to ensure the fidelity in the model. The written protocol prevents deviation from the practice. All implementers use the practice consistently. Teachers and related service providers are accountable for their respective data collection roles, which is overseen by the guidance counselor of the student in question, and then by the IST chairperson. The timeline for data collection and progress monitoring is structured as such in that teams review data frequently enough that drift from implementation would be discovered and time for correction allowed. Core members from the IST, including administration, assume responsibility for ensuring teachers are prepared to and implement interventions appropriately, while at the same time the tiered intervention catalog offers the research source for teachers to follow should questions arise. There is significant ownership of the process by faculty, administration, parents, and students.</p>			



Context of Practice - There is evidence that:			
More fully developed ←		→ Less fully developed	
The practice is delivered to students with disabilities in a general education setting with general education peers most or at all times.	The practice is delivered to students with disabilities in a general education setting with general education peers some or much of the time.	The practice is delivered solely to students with a disability but in a setting providing opportunities for students with disabilities to practice skills with typical peers (e.g., co-located in a general education school)	The practice is delivered solely to students with disabilities in a segregated setting
<p align="center"><b>Look Fors</b></p> <p>Note: the school may have other practices that are more or less inclusive than the nominated practice; this rubric should be evaluated only for the <b><i>nominated practice</i></b></p> <p>Students with disabilities targeted by this practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Share all academic and special area classes and non-academic school activities with their typical peers</li> <li>✓ Are addressed in the same way as their typical peers for classroom and building behavior management and group contingency plans</li> <li>✓ Have equal opportunity to participate in extracurricular activities like clubs, pep rallies, field trips, sports teams, and community service</li> </ul> <p>General education and special education teachers and other educators involved in implementing this practice collaborate in teaching both students with disabilities and their typical peers, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Co-planning, co-teaching, and co-evaluating learning</li> <li>✓ Sharing responsibilities for behavior management and implementation of FBAs and BIPs</li> <li>✓ Collaboration on grading</li> <li>✓ Collaboration on communication with parents</li> </ul>			
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Mineola Middle School is a fully inclusive school, and the time students with disabilities may spend outside of the general education setting would be during their intervention periods. The intervention model is accessible by all students, not just students with disabilities, and the intervention groups are formed based on student need, and may include both classified and non-classified students. At the initial IST Rtl meeting, teachers are assigned their intervention and data collection roles, and the data is analyzed as a team, which promotes a collective responsibility in the students' success.</p>			

**Evidence of Impact - The district/building's data for students with disabilities show:**

**More fully developed** ←

**→ Less fully developed**

- Evidence from norm referenced and/or curriculum based measures that indicate students with disabilities are gaining skills at an accelerated pace that will help close the gap with typical peers
- Progress toward IEP goals is measured regularly and shows successful attainment of relevant and appropriate IEP goals
- Work samples that are evaluated to document growth in skill and adjust interventions
- Clear documentation of results from progress monitoring and intervention adjustment to achieve successful outcome
- Soft data that support the effectiveness of the practice, such as student and parent reports of success in using skills or behaviors in out of school settings

- Evidence from norm referenced and/or curriculum based measures that indicate students with disabilities are gaining skills at or near a typical pace (e.g., a year for a year)
- Progress toward appropriate and relevant IEP goals is measured regularly and shows that goals are achieved a majority of the time
- Work samples are maintained but not analyzed in a structured way
- Documentation of progress monitoring demonstrates recognition of differing response to interventions but is not complete in documenting process of modifications to interventions
- The school has not collected or has not kept records of soft data on the effectiveness of the practice

- Little or no improvement in student outcomes
- Minimal success in attaining appropriate and relevant IEP goals
- No organized documentation to provide evidence of SWD achievement or progression

**Look Fors**

- ✓ Evidence from statewide assessment of success in meeting or making progress toward SPP targets/AYP
- ✓ Interim measures (intermediate assessment data both summative and formative) reflecting positive trajectory of improvement
- ✓ Curriculum-based measurements/progress monitoring data documenting successful outcomes/trajectory of improvement
- ✓ Comparative student work samples demonstrating proficiency or progression in skill/content area
- ✓ Impact of practice on student referral rates to special education

**Comments:**

Mineola reports a lower special education referral rate, which goes hand in hand with their reported reduction in classification rate since the intervention model's implementation. This is attributed to at-risk students receiving the instruction they required for success. Mineola also reports that all subgroups have improved on the State Assessments, as well as gains demonstrated by students within the tiers on progress monitoring CBMs. The district met targets on the AYP State Performance Plan indicators for the 2006-2007 school year. Gains in proficiency percentages for the SWD subgroup were also evidenced on MMS's 2007-2008 Report Card from 2006-2007: 6 ELA from 14 to 39%; 6 Math from 36 to 67%; 7 ELA from 29 to 39%; 7 Math down from 60 to 46%; 8 ELA from 20 to 37%; 8 Math not available. AIMSWeb records demonstrate a positive trajectory for documented students, and the qualitative data the school collected also indicates student success.

**Evidence of Systemic Support for the Practice -- The district/building:**

<b>More fully developed</b> ←		→ <b>Less fully developed</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Has developed a constituency for the practice among families and community by actively advertising and communicating about the practice and its impacts and by providing training to ensure families can support practice as partners in their children's education</li> <li>○ Presents evidence that on-going professional development is provided to all veteran staff involved in project to consistently up-grade skill set.</li> <li>○ Has a practice in place for new hire PD to ensure continuity</li> <li>○ Includes the practice in resource allocation decisions at the building and district level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides on-going PD for veteran staff is embedded within the system and may include: technology, text resources, and conference attendance/turn-key.</li> <li>○ Has a practice in place to ensure that new hires are brought up to speed</li> <li>○ Includes the practice in resource allocation decisions at the building and district level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Presents evidence of on-going PD for veteran staff</li> <li>○ Has a practice in place to ensure that new hires are brought up to speed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Has not explicitly considered strategies to ensure systemic support for the practice</li> </ul>

**Look Fors**

<b>Resource Allocation:</b> ✓ project budgets ✓ BOE notes ✓ PDP or Strategic plan <b>New hire PD:</b> ✓ Orientation/training materials/modules ✓ pre/post assessments	<b>On-going PD:</b> ✓ sign-in/evaluations of PD ✓ conference day agendas ✓ PD materials ✓ conferences attended	<b>Family/Community support:</b> ✓ handbooks & home training modules & materials ✓ parent teacher conference notes ✓ PD Plans that involve families/community members ✓ project meeting notes reflecting actions ✓ newsletter articles
---	--	---

**Comments:**

The archival review evidenced regular staff development for data collection and analysis under the intervention model, ensuring the consistency and accuracy of the practice for veteran and new staff. The district recognizes and utilizes its in-house resources. Support was demonstrated by district-level administration at the start of the site visit, as they referred to MMS as the model for the rest of the district to follow. Family support is also evident through the interviews we had with the parents (and the students), all supporting the model and discussing the positive impact it has had on their children. At the building level, the ownership the teachers expressed in their interviews illustrates the support they have for the model, as does the administration's involvement in the intervention process. The community is included in the process through newsletters, Board of Education presentations, and inviting parents and students to all the IST meetings.

Generalization of Practice within Building or District - The district has:			
More fully developed ←		→ Less fully developed	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Implemented and is monitoring the elements of the plan to generalize the practice to more than one setting (within a school, across classes/grades/buildings and or within the district.</li> <li>○ Documentation of the effective generalization of the practice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Specific plans, resources and a timeline for generalizing the practice (e.g., replicate it in other classrooms, grades, or buildings).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Initiated discussion about generalizing the practice but has not yet put effort or resources into supporting generalization.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The district or building does not anticipate attempting to generalize the practice.</li> </ul>
Look Fors			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Documentation of discussions about generalization, including determining necessary resources to support generalization</li> <li>✓ Specific documentation of strategies for generalization of the practice</li> <li>✓ Documentation of areas/settings that have adopted program (classrooms, grade levels, school/district wide.)</li> <li>✓ Documentation of partnership with another institution (i.e. university/school partnership) in support of generalization</li> </ul>			
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The tiered intervention model was developed by the middle school staff in response to their district office's charge to improve academic outcomes through small group interventions. The practice is used throughout the middle school, for all students, for both academic and behavioral concerns. Documentation of the practice is complete, thorough, and explicit. The middle school staff has offered to assist other schools in the district with the design and implementation of their tiered intervention models. Planning for district-wide generalization was not specifically discussed, but the results of the middle school should generate strong advocacy for the model's implementations in all the district's schools.</p>			

<div> <div></div> <div>← Evidence of Sustainability of Practice – the practice: →</div> </div>			
More fully developed		Less fully developed	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has 4+ years of historic evidence of implementation</li> <li>Has survived changes in key personnel (e.g., Superintendent, Principal, initiating teachers) and/or practice is proactively reflected within system planning documents (mission/vision statements, strategic plan)</li> <li>Is integrated with other established practices within district planning documents</li> <li>Has a contingency plan for significant threat to the practice (fiscal issues that might affect allocation of resources to support the practice, the inevitable eventual departure of staff who have been deeply committed to the development and implementation of the practice)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has 3-4 years of implementation</li> <li>Has survived minimal changes in key personnel</li> <li>Is referenced within district planning documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has been in place 2-3 years</li> <li>May not have experienced significant turnover with key personnel with minimal evidence of practice embedded permanently in the system.</li> <li>Does not appear in district planning documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has been in place a year or less</li> </ul>
Look Fors			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Archival records of the practice over time including records of implementation, monitoring for fidelity, and references to funding</li> <li>✓ Longitudinal data reflecting the impact of the practice</li> <li>✓ District or school planning documents recording support for the practice (PDP, Strategic Plan...)</li> <li>✓ Interviews with key administrators and educators about the history of the practice</li> <li>✓ Evidence of contingency planning relative to loss of key personnel, potential reduction in available resources, et cetera</li> </ul>			
Comments: <p>The process is heavily documented and is a normal part of function in Mineola Middle School, as evidenced during the archival review. Planning, training, professional development, and procedural protocols are all in place. As it was built into the preexistent IST process, the tiered intervention model became a natural extension of a process that has already demonstrated sustainability. Because the protocol is so well established, shifts in personnel should prove successful in keeping the system in place. New personnel are highly likely to develop ownership because the practice is designed strategically for teachers. This practice was done at no additional cost to the district by using available standing committees, personnel, and resources.</p>			

**Other Considerations**  
**Please Provide Additional Information Not Represented Above (No Points Assigned)**

General comment:

Mineola Middle School has demonstrated an effective model for student assessment and tiered intervention delivery. They have a highly organized process for data collection and analysis, and a strong support system to ensure students receive appropriate interventions. With the IST as the focal point, tiered interventions and progress monitoring were successfully established. The documentation, the use of data, the thoroughness of the student profiles, the ease of use of the protocol, the ownership of the process by staff, the administrative support and guidance, and the clear and successful outcomes for students all indicate a practice worthy of validation. The tiered research based interventions are strengths as well. One of the most promising elements of this practice is its low cost, as it is mainly scheduling and staff allocation that enables its function. With the Response to Intervention mandate nearing, Mineola's model would serve districts as a great resource for implementing a similar model.

Look Fors	Comments/Evidence

Site Visit Summary			
District/Building Mineola UFSD/Mineola Middle School		Practice Tiered Instructional Support & Intervention Model	Visit Date(s): May 1, 2009
Practice is: (Check one)		District-wide	
		Grade or Level Specific (describe)	
	<b>X</b>	Specific to One or More Buildings (describe) The nominated practice is specific to the Mineola Middle School.	
		Specific to One or More Departments (describe)	
		Did the Team Reach Consensus? No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Validation Recommendation: Yes <b>X</b> No _____
The team was consistent in their observation and recognizes this tiered instructional support & intervention model as positively impacting students with disabilities. We recommend this practice for validation and inclusion in the Statewide Clearinghouse for Effective Special Education Practices under the S3TAIR Project.			